

Message

From: Low, Tina@Waterboards [Tina.Low@waterboards.ca.gov]
Sent: 4/12/2016 6:35:03 PM
To: Bacey, Juanita@DTSC [Juanita.Bacey@dtsc.ca.gov]; LEE, LILY [LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]
CC: Naugle, Alec@Waterboards [Alec.Naugle@waterboards.ca.gov]
Subject: RE: HPNS- Tetra Tech 4/14 internal investigation report

The Navy should be able to determine when Mr. Smith collected the samples from building 351a. The chain of custody documentation should have the exact dates of sample collection. Maybe bring it up during the next BCT meeting and request the Navy look into it?

Tina J. Low, P.E.
Water Resources Control Engineer
Groundwater Protection Division
San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board
Phone: 510.622.5682

-----Original Message-----

From: Bacey, Juanita@DTSC
Sent: Monday, April 11, 2016 3:35 PM
To: Low, Tina@Waterboards; lee.lily@epa.gov
Cc: Naugle, Alec@Waterboards
Subject: RE: HPNS- Tetra Tech 4/14 internal investigation report

Hi,

I wanted to go back to the news story because I had concern about the dates that Smith worked at the site and the dates that the samples from building 351a were collected (2008). Perhaps he got the dates wrong. Here's what it says:

Smith left his Georgia home in 2002 and worked on and off at Hunters Point as a radiation control technician until 2012. As part of his job, he collected soil samples. That soil was then surveyed to determine contamination levels. Smith said beginning in 2009, his supervisors began instructing him to get rid of contaminated soil samples and replace them with clean soil samples.

Former radiation control technician Anthony Smith collected soil samples on Hunters Point, including underneath a building referred to as Building 351A. The building used to house the Naval Radiological Defense Laboratory. The soil underneath the building had been cleaned up, but Smith says he discovered a soil sample contaminated with radiation even after the building had been remediated. He says his supervisors told him to get rid of the contaminated soil sample and replace it with a clean soil sample from another location. He says it was faster and cheaper for his supervisors to say the soil was clean instead of contaminated. (Published Tuesday, March 8, 2016) He said he collected soil samples underneath a structure referred to as building 351A, which once housed part of the Navy's radiological lab. He recalls a sample tested positive for radium, an element linked to bone cancer. "When I took a sample it came back hot," he said, "and they made me get rid of it." Smith said the building should have been remediated after he found a hot soil sample, but he questions whether crews subsequently cleaned up the contamination. He said remediating the area would have taken more time and money.

-----Original Message-----

From: Low, Tina@Waterboards
Sent: Monday, April 11, 2016 2:04 PM
To: lee.lily@epa.gov
Cc: Bacey, Juanita@DTSC; Naugle, Alec@Waterboards
Subject: RE: HPNS- Tetra Tech 4/14 internal investigation report

Hi Lily and Nina,

Nina, thanks for providing the Tetra Tech investigation report and the email correspondence. As I discussed with Lily, I don't see any indication that the alleged activities impacted groundwater or are currently impacting groundwater. Mr. Smith says he discarded confirmation samples into trenches. I assume that the volume of soil he discarded was relatively small, and not large mass quantities of soil. Also, according to a USGS report, radium is usually only a problem in groundwater when the water is low pH (6 or below) and low DO. I reviewed the latest groundwater data from the BGMP and didn't find exceedances of radium in groundwater even in wells from rad-impacted sites (E-2, IR/7/18, and IR-03). Given all of the above, I don't have immediate concerns that the alleged activities caused radiological impacts to groundwater or surface water.

That said, I do have some questions for the Navy and would like updates on their investigation. I'm glad Lily requested this as a topic for the next BCT meeting. I plan on calling in to the next BCT meeting since I have another meeting that morning that doesn't allow me enough travel time to get to the base.

Thanks,
Tina

p.s. I triple-checked to make sure I'm sending to the correct Lily !

From: Low, Tina@Waterboards
Sent: Monday, April 11, 2016 10:25 AM
To: lee.lily@epa.gov
Cc: Bacey, Juanita@DTSC; Naugle, Alec@Waterboards
Subject: FW: HPNS- Tetra Tech 4/14 internal investigation report

Hi Lily and Nina,
I sent the previous email to Lily Lee at the State Board again. Sorry! Please use this email for any replies.

Thanks,
Tina

From: Bacey, Juanita@DTSC
Sent: Monday, April 11, 2016 10:09 AM
To: Low, Tina@Waterboards
Cc: Lee, Lily@Waterboards; Naugle, Alec@Waterboards
Subject: RE: HPNS- Tetra Tech 4/14 internal investigation report

Hi Tina,
Lily and I have been researching the history. Sorry we didn't include you in all the emails. Lily has been talking to her management about the issue. Attached is the 2014 TTech report. The new accusation by Smith that was not in the report was that soil samples collected from under building 351a were substituted. So this is what we have been focusing on. Attached is the recent info I sent to Lily. Also, I believe Lily already requested that we discuss the issue at the next BCT meeting. Perhaps we'll have time after the BCT meeting on Thursday for the three of us to discuss (if you are attending).

-----Original Message-----
From: Low, Tina@Waterboards
Sent: Friday, April 08, 2016 3:08 PM
To: Robinson, Derek@VCGCB
Cc: Lee, Lily@Waterboards; Bacey, Juanita@DTSC; Naugle, Alec@Waterboards
Subject: HPNS- Tetra Tech 4/14 internal investigation report

Hi Derek,
Could you email me a copy of the April 2014 Tetra Tech report that documents the internal investigation? In your email below, you stated that the 2014 investigation did not include information from Mr. Smith because he could not be reached for interviews. I understand that investigations are ongoing. My main question is: How can we be sure that all confirmation sample data used in decision making (i.e., closing out sites) is valid and not falsified? What are the steps in the Navy's investigation process?

Thanks,
Tina

From: LEE, LILY [LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]
Sent: Wednesday, March 23, 2016 4:29 PM
To: Bacey, Juanita@DTSC; Low, Tina@Waterboards
Subject: Some more details from Navy FW: Tetra Tech & Rad

-----Original Message-----
From: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO [mailto:derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil]
Sent: Wednesday, March 23, 2016 1:31 PM
To: LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>
Cc: Janda, Danielle L CIV NAVFAC SW <danielle.janda@navy.mil>
Subject: RE: Tetra Tech & Rad - confirming my notes

Dear Lily,

Here is what I can officially confirm.

Investigations by multiple agencies are on-going. Mr. Anthony Smith has been interviewed as part of at least some of these investigations.

. The BRAC office has entered unfavorable reviews about Tetra Tech's performance at Hunters Point to the contract actions responsible for anomalous soil sampling. Tetra Tech has not been awarded new contracts in 2015 or 2016 at Hunters Point. However, Tetra Tech is currently completing work under previously awarded contracts.

So far, Mr. Smith has stated the following:

- . He worked for Tetra Tech during the period of time that soil samples were in question.
- . He was ordered to collect confirmation samples from remediated areas that were later replaced with other soils.
- . Confirmation soil samples that were not sent to the lab were used as fill in excavated areas.
- . He observed falsification of samples on confirmation sampling after cleanup was conducted.
- . At Building 351A, before remediation, a sample in the crawl space under the building was found to be contaminated. The area was remediated. Tetra Tech falsified confirmation sampling that was collected in this area.
- . Tetra Tech's motivation was to close out the backfilling of trenches sooner to save resources.

The Tetra Tech internal investigation 4/14

- . Included all radiological samples collected by Tetra Tech during this period and under the implicated contracts for radiological projects at Hunters Point.
- . Did not include information from Mr. Smith because he could not be reached for interviews during the time of the investigation.

The Navy's Radiation Affairs Support Office (RASO) is evaluating allegations by Mr. Smith.

Radium has not been detected at levels of concern in groundwater at Hunters Point Naval Shipyard. There is no reason to believe that the soil sampling activities alleged by Mr. Smith would cause a groundwater issue.

Derek